

**Gravatt, Dan**

---

**From:** Peterson, Mary  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 09, 2014 9:10 PM  
**To:** Slugantz, Lynn; Field, Jeff; Gravatt, Dan; Washburn, Ben; Kiefer, Robyn V NWK  
**Cc:** Beringer, Mike; Phillips, Todd  
**Subject:** DRAFT Q&A for 10-14-14 CAG  
**Attachments:** QandA for 10-14-14 CAG.docx

See attached draft for discussion during tomorrow's dry run. It is still a work in progress.

***Mary P. Peterson, Acting Deputy Director***

Office of Public Affairs

EPA Region 7

11201 Renner Blvd.

Lenexa, KS 66219

913-551-7882 - desk

816-398-3945 - mobile

0714

40498581

3.0



Superfund

0201

## Q&A for 10-14-14 CAG Meeting

1. Will the WL risk assessment be updated for the next proposed plan/ROD?

*Answer: The main purpose of a BLRA is to establish a basis supporting a decision about whether or not any remedial action is necessary. The existing WL BLRA concludes that there is a risk outside the target range for future exposure scenarios and therefore supports the decision that an action is justified. Since we already have established the need to take action, there is no need or benefit to doing more risk assessment work. Our efforts are better focused on gathering the data we need to support the remedy selection.*

2. How will the new groundwater data be accounted for in terms of a risk assessment?

*Answer: The more recent groundwater data is being evaluated by USGS, and will certainly be reflected in future proposed plans and decision documents. In addition, ATSDR is performing a Health Consultation that will evaluate health considerations associated with groundwater exposures.*

3. Why aren't all the chemicals shown on the list of COPCs? It appears that some are missing.

*Answer: Chemicals of Potential Concern include those chemicals that are found in a high percentage of samples and at high levels. The list of COPCs does not include every chemical tested for or detected at a site.*

4. Why weren't residential exposures considered or evaluated?

*Answer: Residential exposure scenarios were not evaluated because there is no data showing offsite contamination from the site. In fact, there exists a large body of offsite data suggesting that offsite exposures are not occurring. If there is no exposure, there is no risk.*

5. Were children considered separately from adults?

*Answer: Since residential exposure scenarios did not need to be evaluated, there was no need to evaluate risk to children specifically. Pathways that were considered complete, such as future construction worker, would not apply to children.*

6. If residential scenarios weren't even evaluated, how can you say that you are protecting public health?

*Answer: Our statements about the protection of public health are based on a solid body of data indicating no offsite exposures. Furthermore, EPA's offsite air monitoring system collects data around the clock, and has not shown any elevated levels of radiation or radionuclides.*

7. Given the results of the recent MDHSS cancer incidence report, how can you continue to say that there is no offsite exposure?

*Answer: The MDHSS report is based on actual known cases of cancer in certain zipcodes, and not on site-related data or contamination. EPA defines risk in terms of known site-related contamination and possible exposure pathways. So there really is no comparison between the two – they have a completely different scientific basis and purpose. There is a large body of data indicating no offsite exposures, and EPA's conclusions are based on this body of scientific data.*

8. You keep referring to a large body of offsite data – what does that consist of?

*Answer: RI data ----*

*MDNR data ---*

*DOE data ---*

*ASPECT overflight data ---*

*BMAC data ---*

*MDNR and EPA offsite air monitoring data*